

October 6

A7358

of friends fill us with joy. May we feel a spirit of uplift and inspiration from this celebration.

It is my privilege now to welcome home one of Hopewell's favorite sons. His father served this church for his entire pastorate from 1879 to 1911—32 years. Some of you remember Rev. John A. White with love and respect and many of us remember his saintly mother most fondly. Dr. Francis White received his early education in the Blackstock public school and then finished Erskine College. After serving in the Army for a year and a half, he entered the Erskine Seminary, finishing in 1919. He received his degree of master of theology from Princeton. His first charge was the ARP Church of Gastonia which he served for 18 years. Since 1940, he has continuously served the Spartanburg ARP Church.

He married Miss Kate Patton Kennedy of Due West, and they have two children, Susan and Francis.

Dr. White needs no introduction, but only a welcome to Hopewell.

The following report of the proceedings are from the Chester News, June 27, 1962.

HOPWELL ASSOCIATE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH CELEBRATES 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Some 300 persons assembled Sunday on the historical grounds of Hopewell Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the church.

Services commenced with morning worship led by the Rev. W. A. Kennedy, Jr., D.D., pastor of Coddle Creek (N.C.) Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the son of Dr. W. A. Kennedy, now retired, and former pastor of Hopewell, assisted by Mr. Donald Elliott, supply minister.

Appearing on the special anniversary program were L. S. Wier, of Great Falls, C. R. Younts, the Rev. F. T. White of Spartanburg, and Baxter Bigham, of Matthews, N.C.

After the program a bountiful picnic lunch was enjoyed in the grove of the churchyard.

The historical address, given on the anniversary program, had been prepared by Mr. John A. Bigham, of Columbia, and when circumstances beyond his control would not permit his attending, he called upon his brother, Mr. Baxter Bigham, to deliver the address.

Mr. Bigham's address is as follows:

"The story of the congregation here at Hopewell can be easily traced if we will give brief attention to a number of factors which, blended together, have formed 175 years of honorable history and glorious contribution to the church of Christ on earth. As important ingredients in the makeup of Hopewell's past I would list first her devoted pastors, second, the strength, character, and loyalty of her membership through the long years, and third, the buildings of wood and brick which were raised on this spot so that the men and women and children of Hopewell might find a place of refuge, of inspiration, of fellowship, and of acceptable worship.

"Nor should there be omitted from the story of Hopewell the contribution she has made to the denomination for these 175 years. This beloved church has given of her young men and women in abundance, 28 to be ministers of the Gospel and 1 to be a foreign missionary. Not only is the church's role in this respect most worthy, but since the earliest days Hopewell has been instrumental in establishing other churches. This outpouring of her own resources and own strength has resulted in at least 27 congregations, some nearby, others in distant States.

"We would be remiss if there was not mentioned today the countless number of in-

dividuals, who down through the years, have left Hopewell to join churches elsewhere, both within the denomination and outside it. Wherever these have gone they have played an active part in the work of the kingdom, and through these lives and witnessses have reflected their youthful training here at Hopewell.

"Join with me this morning, if you will, and in the mind's eye let us look back over 175 years. Let us try to reconstruct a picture of this church's history through its dedicated pastors who have served here, through the membership of other days, and of the present time, and through the four houses of worship which at various times were built, that in this place men would have a place to worship God.

"Let us envision the year 1787. The Constitution of the United States is in the process of being adopted by the several States. George Washington has been chosen to head the new nation as its first president. Here in the upcountry of South Carolina along the banks of Rocky Creek small groups of Christian people, affiliated in one way or another to the Presbyterian family, have been gathering for the past few years at a place of worship uniquely called Catholic. These are people in a new land, lately come from North Ireland and Scotland either by way of Pennsylvania or through the port of Charleston. Already they are referred to as the Scotch-Irish, and the descriptive name of Rocky Creek Irish has been given those who settled here in southeastern Chester County.

"Among these worshippers at Catholic are Associates, and Reformed or Convenanters, two or three other brands of Presbyterians, and doubtless just some plain ordinary Presbyterians. Whatever their differences they are united in their deep religious convictions, and their fierce independence, and in their desire to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences. These were our forefathers, and from among them were to come those who would establish Hopewell.

"The year 1787 may have witnessed many great events in our Nation's history, but we are mostly interested this morning in the fact that the Reverend Matthew Linn organized in that year a congregation which was the beginning of Hopewell. For some time, we know not how long, the church would be known as Rocky Creek. Then the name Hopewell became popular and was adopted. I have tried to determine the origin of the name Hopewell, but to no avail. We know that Bethel and Hebron and Ebenezer as names for churches came from the Bible, but whence the name Hopewell?

"As was mentioned at the 150th anniversary 25 years ago, time at Hopewell is more or less reckoned with us by designating the names of pastors who have served here. The old people say, or used to say, "In Mr. White's time," or "In Mr. Brice's time." Now there is a generation arisen who will look back and say, "In Dr. Kennedy's time." So let us, for a few moments, reckon time by recalling Hopewell's pastors through the years.

"The church's first pastor was the Reverend John Boyse, and let's mention he spelled his name with an "s" rather than a "c." He was sent to this section by the A.R.P. presbytery of Pennsylvania. Not only did the Reverend John Boyse preach at Hopewell, but he performed the rather remarkable feat of also simultaneously pastoring the three congregations of Gilead, Prosperity, and Coddle Creek in North Carolina. Even in this modern day of fast transportation such a broad field would be difficult for one man to serve effectively. Mr. Boyse had been born in Ireland in 1759. He died in 1793, but not before getting Hopewell off to a good start on her 175 years, and also helping in the formation of the first presbytery of the Associate Reformed church to be located in the South.

"Hopewell's second pastor was the Reverend John Hemphill, D.D. He was born in County Derry, Ireland, in 1761, and came to the church here from Pennsylvania. History records that two young men from Hopewell went to Pennsylvania for their new pastor, each riding a horse and each leading one. The Reverend Mr. Hemphill and his wife then rode the 500 miles back to South Carolina, bringing a young child with them. In his 36 years at Hopewell, Dr. Hemphill became the foremost man in all this region. His descendants to this day are prominent in the pulpit, in law, and in the councils of the Nation. When Dr. Hemphill died, one who was not a member of Hopewell said, "Dr. Hemphill made Rocky Creek what it is."

"During the vacancy from 1830 to 1832 there was much to discourage the work: political differences, the question of Nullification, slavery agitation pro and con, and particularly a fever among many people to move to the West and Northwest. These migrations greatly reduced the membership of the congregation, but the bright side of the picture appeared when these people carried their faith with them and established Hopewells in the new lands to which they went.

"The third pastor was the Reverend Warren Flenniken. He was the first minister at Hopewell to be born in America, being a native of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. He has been described as a man of wonderfully magnetic personality who attracted others to him. He has also been pictured as a stern disciplinarian who could portray in the pulpit the terrors of hell so vividly that men could almost feel themselves falling into the fire and brimstone.

"Mr. Flenniken served until 1849 when his health failed. The fourth pastor was the Rev. Robert Wilson Brice who came in 1850 and labored at Hopewell until his death in 1878. He was born in Fairfield County near New Hope church. His descendants are everywhere about us in this section. The Rev. Mr. Brice was at Hopewell during the dark days of the Confederate War, and during the Reconstruction years. Old Dr. Lathan, writing in his History of Hopewell, was of the opinion that the two greatest days in her history came on the day Mr. Brice was installed as pastor, and the day his body was laid away in the cemetery.

"The Rev. John A. White came to Hopewell in 1879 to begin a pastorate lasting for 42 years. This fifth pastor was different from the others in that he was born and raised in the congregation. My father's account of Hopewell's history, given 25 years ago, paid tribute to Mr. White as "the only pastor I ever knew, and whose memory in the hearts of the people represents his real monument." Because of this relationship between my father and Hopewell's fifth pastor, I consider it a real privilege to be associated on the program today with the Reverend Francis White, a son of the Reverend John A. White.

"The Reverend R. I. McCown, was pastor of Hopewell from 1913 to 1918. He was the only minister who ever gave up the pastorate here to accept other work. Although Mr. McCown was at Hopewell only 5 years he guided the congregation through the troublous days of World War I.

"The seventh and most recent pastor of Hopewell was the Reverend W. A. Kennedy, D.D., father of our minister at this special service. Dr. Kennedy came to the pastorate in 1919 and continued until his retirement 2 years ago. Borrowing a statement of my father concerning Mr. White, and changing it appropriately, I can say with many others here today that Dr. Kennedy was the only pastor of Hopewell I ever knew.

"At the risk of perhaps borrowing too much, let me also quote from the historical address 25 years ago which stated that 'Rev.

Since July, when the volume of Soviet military shipments to Cuba suddenly vaulted upward, 85 shiploads arrived in Cuban ports. Many of them carried military items, supplies and personnel. These shipments have consisted, in part, of types of weapons previously delivered to the Cuban armed forces, including more tanks, self-propelled guns, and other ground force equipment. The major tonnage in recent shipments, however, has been devoted to SA-2, surface-to-air missiles (SAMS)—together with all the related gear and equipment necessary for their installation and operation. To date, fifteen SAM sites have been established in the island. We estimate the total may eventually reach 25. These are antiaircraft missiles having a slant range of 20 to 25 miles.

In addition, three and possibly four missile sites of a different type have been identified. These sites are similar to known Soviet coastal defense missile sites that are believed to accommodate antishipping missiles with a range of 20-35 miles. Quite likely several more such sites will be installed.

Cuba is now estimated to have 60 older type Mig jet aircraft. In addition at least one advanced jet-interceptor has recently been received, and probably several more are in the process of assembly. This type of advanced jet-interceptor is usually equipped with infrared air-to-air missiles. We estimate that the total of these advanced interceptors in Cuba may eventually reach 25 to 30.

In addition, 16 "Komar" class guided missile, patrol boats which carry two short-range missiles (11-17 miles), were included in recent shipments.

About 4,500 Soviet military specialists have arrived, including construction men and technicians.

VIII

Unpleasant as may be the spectacle of a Communist-dominated island just off our shores, we should not overlook the fact that Cuba is, at the moment, a small enfeebled country with an incompetent government, a limping economy and a deteriorating standard of living. The crash efforts of the Soviet Union to provide the Castro regime with economic technicians and to build up its military defenses is a demonstration of Cuban weakness. Because of the desperate plight of the Cuban economy, Cuba's isolation from the other nations of the hemisphere and the fear which that isolation has engendered, the Cuban Government has turned itself into a dependency of Moscow.

We may take the events of the past month—regrettable as they may be in many ways—as evidence of the essential soundness of the strategy of isolation that we have pursued toward Cuba over the past 2 years. The additional measures now under consideration with respect to Cuban shipping are part and parcel of that same strategy.

We propose to continue along these lines, taking new measures as the developing situation may require. But in pursuing this policy—as in pursuing any policy—the United States must never forget that it is engaged in a worldwide struggle and that no policy can be regarded as an end in itself or as existing apart from the whole complex of relationships which give the free world its strength.

And, as the President has made clear, we shall not rely solely on the impact of political and economic isolation for our protection. If, contrary to the present evidence, it should ever appear that the Soviet Union is succeeding in making Cuba a threat to the security of this country or this hemisphere, we are prepared to take the necessary action—whatever it may be.

The 175th Anniversary of Hopewell Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, Blackstock, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the Nation and the world, through the media of this Record to a history of good works, example and inspiration emanating from the origination and continuation of Hopewell Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church near Blackstock, S.C., in Chester County. On June 24, 1962, the minister and congregation, invited friends, and descendants of former members, celebrated the 175th anniversary of this great church. People gathered from many areas of the country, particularly many areas of South Carolina. All who gathered were inspired with new appreciations and their hearts were full of gratitude to the Master who gave us the privilege of associating with this, His church. I would like to incorporate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the program, the very appropriate remarks of Mr. L. C. Weir, whose family has been associated with the church and among the great workers of the church for many generations.

I also include a news item containing an excerpt from the history of the church prepared by Mr. John A. Bigham, whom I salute as an interesting and accomplished historian. The program included a timely sermon of Rev. W. A. Kennedy, Jr., D.D., whose father led the congregation in prayer and worship for so many fruitful years. Before inserting these, I might add that we were proud to have remarks from Mr. C. R. Younts, twice elected moderator of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Synod of South Carolina, a most distinguished layman of his denomination. Mrs. Ester Strong, whose work in the circles of the church has been an inspiration and benefit to the church through the years, and Mrs. J. I. McKeown, whose husband was pastor of the church for so many years.

I include these because of the contribution of the Scotch-Irish people to the formation of America and the conquest of dangerous and formidable backwoods in establishing a frontier of another day lingers with us in the form of freedom. I urge not only the careful attention of those reading this, but hope that their hearts will surge with great appreciation for churches such as this wonderful institution. For my part, I am proud that my Christian heritage is linked with this church and its history. I now include appropriate parts of the program:

PROGRAM

(Remarks of Mr. L. S. Weir who introduced Dr. Francis White, who, in turn, introduced Mr. Baxter Bigham who read the address of his brother, John A. Bigham:)

The Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church as the name might indicate, is a result of a union of two churches which united in Philadelphia, November 1782.

The associate branch of our church came from the Associate Presbytery of Scotland which was organized at Gairney Bridge, December 1733. This was known as the Secession Church. They came out of the Church of Scotland because of certain practices which were undemocratic and un-Presbyterian. The particular grievance was the practice of patronage, by which the chief landowner of a parish had the privilege of selecting the pastor when the church was vacant. Ebenezer Erskine condemned this practice of the church as being unscriptural in a sermon before the synod which met at Perth. He was rebuked by the synod and later suspended by the assembly along with his associates. They, with a few others who withdrew in sympathy with them, organized the Associate Presbytery. Today, all Presbyterians have this privilege of choosing their own pastor.

The other branch was organized as the Reformed Presbytery, August 1743, and they were called the "covenanters." Their particular objection to the Church of Scotland was that it recognized the King as the head of the church, which they said denied its spiritual independence and was in conflict with the sole headship of Jesus Christ. This tenet so important to the covenanters is a fundamental principle of American protestantism.

The term "reformed" was doubtless chosen as the name because all the Presbyterian or Calvinistic churches of the continent of Europe used the name "reformed." The term "Presbyterian" is largely an English and American term as it refers to a particular denomination. These two groups in America found that they had so much in common that they united to form the Associate Reformed Church in North America. There were, however, some of each group which did not go into the union.

Our particular part of the church was organized as the Synod of the Carolinas in the old brick church in Fairfield County, May 9, 1803 (16 years after Hopewell was founded). In 1822, the Synod of the Carolinas withdrew and constituted itself as an independent synod under the name of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. It has remained independent and its official name today is the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. Territorially, our church is only in the South. It consists of six presbyteries spreading from Virginia to Florida, and from Missouri to Texas. Doctrinally, it holds to the Presbyterian standards of the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms. Stated very briefly, we believe in the sovereignty of God, the saviourhood of Christ, and the authority of the Holy Scriptures. As to its government, our church is a representative democracy. It is governed by the session, the members of which are elected by the people to represent them.

Speaking for Hopewell, I can sincerely say, "This is your church. Make of me what you will. I shall reflect you as clearly as a mirror. If outwardly my appearance is pleasing and inviting, it is because we have made it so. If, within, my spiritual atmosphere is kindly, yet earnest; reverent, yet friendly; worshipful, yet sincere; sympathetic, yet strong; divine, yet humanly expressed, it is but the manifestation of the spirit of those who constitute my membership."

You, as members of Hopewell, or members of the churches mothered by Hopewell, or friends of Hopewell, are indeed welcomed today for this 175th anniversary. Memories of loved ones flood our emotions, and faces

A7356

Latin America; now it is the seventh. The glittering promises of new and more adequate housing have proven false. Military needs have eaten into the limited construction resources.

Cuba is a rich land with a friendly climate and a fertile soil. But as always the Communists have proven themselves poor farmers. The 1962 sugar crop will be the smallest in the last 6 years—and by a substantial margin. Meat supplies have declined sharply; they remain below the level prevailing before the Castro takeover. With domestic production at a low level and food-stuff imports greatly reduced, nationwide rationing has been inevitable.

Cuba has had the world's richest sugar economy, with only the beginnings of industrialization. In pre-Castro days Cuba lived primarily by selling sugar to the United States. In her present posture of isolation she is living badly—and then only as a dependent of the Soviet Union.

III

Cuba is isolated from the other nations of the free world economically, politically, and spiritually.

Castro contributed to that isolation in December of 1961 by making it perfectly explicit that he was a dedicated Communist. In January 1962 the Foreign Ministers of the OAS at Punta del Este declared that the present Government of Cuba was excluded from participation in the inter-American system. Since the Punta del Este Conference, the American States have carried out that decision. They have also established machinery to guard against subversive activities in this hemisphere.

The situation today can be summarized by a relatively few statistics. In 1958 United States-Cuban trade totaled more than a billion dollars. Today it is confined to minute exports of certain nonsubsidized foods and medical supplies which amounted, during the first 7 months of this year, to only \$373,000—and those shipments were permitted only for humanitarian reasons.

In its Cuban trade, Canada in 1959 had total imports and exports amounting to over \$27 million; for the first 6 months of this year they amounted to less than \$7 million.

In 1959 the other Latin American countries did total trade with Cuba amounting to \$82 million; in 1961 this had fallen to \$20 million.

The nations of Western Europe have also reduced their trade with Cuba. In 1959 their exports to Cuba were approximately \$122 million. By 1961 this figure had been cut to less than half.

IV

This drying up of trade has not been an accident. It has been a deliberate response by this country and its allies to the Communist efforts to establish a beachhead for subversion in this hemisphere.

The process of isolating Cuba economically began in July 1960 when the United States prohibited the further import of Cuban sugar into this country. This cost Cuba the annual amount of \$350 million in foreign exchange. Three months later we prohibited the export of United States goods to Cuba except only for the limited food and medicines mentioned above.

In February of this year, President Kennedy made the embargo on Cuban trade substantially complete, extending the embargo to sugar to all other imports, whether direct or indirect.

America's allies, both in the OAS and NATO have collaborated in limiting trade with Cuba. At Punta del Este the OAS Foreign Ministers agreed to prohibit trade with Cuba in arms and implements of war. The Coun-

cil of the OAS undertook to study further trade restrictions.

Our NATO allies have prohibited the export of any military items to Cuba and they have indicated that they are not shipping any strategic items. They are also cooperating to assure that United States exports will not be diverted to Cuba through their ports.

Until early this year Japan was one of the principal free world purchasers of Cuban sugar. As a result of discussions with the Japanese Government, the Japanese are shifting their purchases of sugar to other free world sources. Castro has not only been denied the foreign exchange he desperately needs but Japanese exports to Cuba are declining as well.

V

The economic isolation of Cuba has been effected not merely by cutting off credits and goods, but also by imposing restrictions on the shipping available for sustaining Cuban trade with the bloc.

We have prohibited ships registered under the flag of the United States from transporting to Cuba commodities on the United States positive list, the United States munitions list, and items controlled by the Atomic Energy Commission. This amendment will also affect about 360 foreign flag vessels whose owners have contractually agreed not to violate the transportation order.

Moreover, bunkers are denied in United States ports to all vessels under charter to the Sino-Soviet bloc engaged in Cuba-bloc trade; Cuban owned or chartered vessels are also denied bunkers and ships stores in this country.

As an island, Cuba is entirely dependent upon shipping for the maintenance of its tottering economy. With the decline of the Cuban economy and with the Soviet buildup of arms and aid, ships and shipping have emerged as a special problem.

Cuba relies upon imports for most of her machinery and equipment, petroleum, steel, chemicals, wood, and paper products, cotton and, to some extent, grain. Cuba is, however, a small country. Total imports to Cuba in 1961 amounted to \$641 million; exports during that year stood at \$614 million. The total trade of Cuba was therefore less than one-half percent of world trade. In 1959, 2.2 percent of Cuba's exports went to the Sino-Soviet bloc; by 1961, 75.7 percent went to the bloc.

No U.S.-flag ships have called at Cuba within the last 2 years. Ships calling at Cuba are of three kinds: Soviet bloc ships, free world ships under free world operation, and free world ships chartered to the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union has offered high rates to charter free world ships at a time when depressed conditions in the industry have produced nearly 3 million tons of unemployed laid-up shipping.

These three kinds of shipping carry different sorts of cargo to Cuba. The Soviet ships carry general cargo, petroleum and arms. No other ships carry arms. The free world ships not under charter, typically carry peacetime commodities—food, textiles, etc.; more important they do not usually participate in trade between the bloc and Cuba which, as I have noted, supplies Cuba's economic needs. That trade moves to a considerable extent on free world ships which have been chartered by the Soviet Union and which are used to transport Soviet bloc cargoes though not to repeat—arms or ammunition. Statistics on ships calling at Cuban harbors have recently been compiled by the Maritime Administrator. These figures show that a majority of the ships stopping in Cuba are under free world flags, but, as a result of Soviet charter, more than a majority are under Soviet shipping orders and carrying Soviet cargoes.

As this situation has emerged, the U.S. Government has recognized that it should take steps to curtail or prevent the use of free world shipping in the Soviet bloc-Cuban trade. With this purpose in mind, the Department of State has during the last month approached our allies on this matter.

So far, five of our NATO allies have taken positive actions to restrict the availability of ships.

The Federal Republic of Germany has promulgated a new ordinance bringing all Federal Republic ship charters to bloc countries under license and barring Cuba as a destination for such charters. It is our understanding that Canada and France have no ships presently in the Cuba trade.

Belgium is taking steps to stop all traffic with Cuba on its flag vessels. Turkey has informed this Government that it plans to put into effect measures which will assure that, in the future, no Turkish vessel will carry cargo of any type from the Soviet Union to Cuba.

The Italian Government has assured us that no strategic goods have been transported to Cuba on Italian ships.

We are continuing to discuss this problem with our other allies, including the United Kingdom, Greece, Norway and Denmark. These are great maritime nations that depend heavily on their merchant marine for their foreign-exchange earnings—and today there is much unemployed shipping. These nations have long and deeply-felt traditions regarding "freedom of shipping." Nevertheless, they are giving careful consideration to our requests, and have given informal advice to their shipowners in an effort to discourage them from allowing their ships to engage in strategic trade with Cuba.

VI

In spite of the progress that has been made so far, the executive branch of the Government is not yet satisfied that all useful measures have been taken to limit the shipping available for the maintenance of the Cuban economy. We are considering several additional measures designed to impose restrictions on the availability of shipping to Cuba.

Secretary Rusk is consulting today with the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States with regard to those measures. At the same time they are being discussed with our NATO allies. Because these matters are under consultation with foreign governments, it would not be proper for me to disclose them in public session today. I am, however, prepared to discuss them with this committee in executive session at this time. Or I should be glad to review them with this committee on another occasion, after the process of consultation has been completed.

While I cannot properly talk about all of the measures now under consideration, there is one which, I feel certain, will be adopted. This will be an order prohibiting ships of U.S. registry or ships of foreign registry owned by a U.S. citizen from participating in the Cuban trade. The exact terms of this order are now being worked out by our legal and shipping experts.

VII

As a result of the measures that have been taken by the United States and by the members of the OAS, NATO, Japan, and other countries, Cuba today is almost totally dependent upon the Soviet Union for its economic livelihood. Three-fourths of Cuba's trade is with the Communist bloc, and this percentage is increasing as other channels of trade dry up.

In the last few weeks we have read much in the newspapers of the military buildup of Cuba by the Soviet Union. Quite clearly it does not constitute a threat to the United States.

Transport of Commodities to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, as all my colleagues are aware, I have been concerned, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Export Control, over the export of commodities to all Communist countries by our country as well as by our allies which would significantly contribute to the economic or military potential of those countries and prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

On September 26 in a statement to my colleagues in the House, I made reference to the deepening concern in Congress and throughout the country over the continuing Castro-Soviet economic and military buildup in Cuba, and announced that the House Select Committee on Export Control would hold hearings on October 2 and 3 to clarify U.S. policy as to certain aspects of the situation this country faces in the Caribbean.

As a predicate to my announcement of these hearings, I had particular reference, Mr. Speaker, to the persistent reports in the press and on the floor of the House and Senate, that the shipment of a significant volume of Communist-produced goods and materials, strategic and otherwise, were reaching Cuba in ships registered under flags of our NATO Allies.

Since that time there have been reports indicating that possibly American-owned ships of foreign registry have been engaged in transport of commodities to Cuba.

Appearing before the select committee at the hearings held as scheduled were several prominent witnesses from American shipowner groups flying the American flag and a representative of a similar group flying the flags of Panama, Honduras, and Liberia, commonly referred to as "flags of convenience." High-level officials of maritime unions conversant with the many facets of worldwide shipping to Cuba and the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, gave enlightening detailed testimony.

During the 2 days devoted to Cuban trade, the select committee sought to develop:

First. The extent of free-world shipping in Cuban trade.

Second. How much shipping adversely affects our national security and welfare and assists in the spread of the Communist international conspiracy.

Third. What is being done about it?

Fourth. What has been accomplished?

The recorded detailed testimony, in my opinion, furnishes rather complete answers to all these questions. It will be printed and distributed to all of my colleagues in the House and other interested persons as soon as possible.

In the meantime, I want to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a few pertinent

personal observations concluded after hearing all the testimony:

Although the several persons representing the maritime unions and shipowner groups have some divergent interests and are involved in unsettled controversial issues, all were in complete accord that directly and indirectly, our Government should aggressively continue its efforts to induce our allies to cut off assistance in shipping strategic commodities to Cuba which would make a significant contribution to her economic or military buildup.

I was indeed pleased to note that immediately subsequent to the appearance of the several persons representing the maritime unions and shipowner groups before the select committee on October 2, 1962, the State Department confirmed publicly in a press conference on October 4, measures under consideration to control trade in the bloc-Cuban trade. The proposed measures, not yet firmed up or officially adopted, were briefly brought to the attention of the select committee in executive session in a hearing on October 3, by Hon. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State.

As a result of the information supplied to the select committee by Mr. Ball and a detailed review of a transcript of the proceedings at a State Department press conference on October 4, I directed a letter to Mr. Ball on October 5, quoted in part, as follows:

It is my understanding that the following measures to control trade in the bloc-Cuban trade are under consideration and are being afforded further study and may be placed into effect in the near future:

1. Close all United States ports to all ships of any country if any ship under the flag of that country hereafter carries arms to Cuba.

2. No U.S. Government (including Government-financed) cargo to be carried on a foreign flagship, if any ship of the same owners is used hereafter in bloc-Cuban trade.

3. No United States flagship and no U.S.-owned ship to carry goods to or from Cuba.

4. Close all United States ports to any ship that on the same continuous voyage was used or is being used in bloc-Cuban trade.

I have reviewed the transcript of the discussion of these four proposals as recorded at the time of the State Department press conference on October 4. I am pleased with the proposals to tighten control over shipping to Cuba as far as they go—but they are not sufficiently stringent.

I note in a review of the transcript of the comments at the press conference previously referred to, bloc-Cuban trade refers to bloc-originated shipments going to Cuba or Cuban-originated shipments going to the bloc, and does not apply to commodities originating in non-bloc countries such as West German, the United Kingdom, or Italy.

I urge that these measures be implemented to apply to any shipments from any country to Cuba that would make a significant contribution to the economic or military buildup of Communist Cuba.

In addition, as I indicated at the time of the hearing conducted by this committee on October 3, a policy should be established that no license be issued for the importation of any oil into the United States in a tanker of any country which has carried Russian oil to Cuba. Let Russia tie up her own fleet in carrying on trade with Cuba.

I am fully aware that the unilateral action on the part of the United States as proposed in your measures now being consid-

ered cannot have the effect of tight multilateral control by all of the free-world countries. But I agree with your statement in your referenced letter of this date "that the measures we are taking will materially contribute to the strategy isolating Cuba," as you had previously indicated in your testimony furnished this committee on October 3.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out that Mr. Ball, the Under Secretary of State, in addition to his lucid and enlightening oral testimony in open and executive sessions of the select committee furnished in a prepared statement specific and detailed facts relative to the critical Cuban problem. As black as the situation understandably appears to many of our people, I am encouraged by the expressed determination of the administration to prevent an offensive military buildup in Cuba. I am sure that Mr. Ball's statement prepared for the select committee is of interest to my colleagues which is quoted as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE W. BALL, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 3, 1962

Mr. Chairman, in your letter requesting me to appear here this morning you indicated the continuing interest of this committee in the status of trade between the free world and the Sino-Soviet bloc. But you emphasized particularly the trade with Cuba. Since the problem of Cuba is very much on the minds of the American people today—and of real concern to this committee—I shall concentrate in my prepared statement on the present trading relations between the free world and Cuba. I shall attempt not only to describe those relations but to relate them to the larger problem which a Communist-dominated Cuba poses for the United States and the free world.

Our policy toward Cuba is based upon the assessment that it does not today constitute a military threat to the United States. Without doubt it is an economic burden for the Sino-Soviet bloc. It has value to the bloc primarily as a base for the subversive activities of international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

The policy of the U.S. Government is directed toward nullifying Cuba's usefulness as a source of infection for international communism, while at the same time rendering it more costly for the Sino-Soviet bloc to maintain it for that purpose.

In pursuit of this objective we have taken a series of measures both unilaterally and in collaboration with our friends and allies. These measures have already weakened the Castro regime and they have made it a pariah among the member nations of the American system.

President Kennedy summed up the present situation effectively when he recently said: "It is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year, his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries."

Mr. Castro's trouble is reflected in the state of the Cuban economy today.

Since the end of 1960, living standards in Cuba have fallen precipitously. By Government fiat the total volume of workers' salaries has been increased and rents have been reduced, but this is an illusory achievement. The volume of goods available for purchase by the population has drastically shrunk. Per capita food consumption has declined by more than 15 percent. In pre-Castro days Cuba was the third highest in

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7351

involve frequent future visits to the Capitol City. These visits will be pleasantly anticipated by all who have served with him.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing regret that FRANK BOYKIN is leaving the official duties that he has so ably performed as a Representative of the people of Alabama. And, I extend my best wishes to him as he returns to private life.

Remarks by Hon. Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Minneapolis, Minn., August 14, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the basic principles—one long adhered to by the Committee on Armed Services of this House, and this House as a whole—is that the men and women of our armed services must be considered as individuals and not as merely entries on an electronic computer tape.

This recognition of the importance of the individual in our Armed Forces has long guided our legislative thinking with respect to defense personnel matters. As Members of this House are well aware, there have been instances in the past when it appeared that the Pentagon was not sufficiently sensitive to the importance of the individual.

Consequently, it has been a reassuring experience for me to read the recent speech of the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, the Honorable Norman S. Paul, which was delivered at the 1962 Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Minneapolis, Minn.

Secretary Paul's remarks emphasized the importance of individual servicemen and their families. His emphasis upon considering the personnel of our Armed Forces as individuals and not as "so many numbers lumped in the mass" is a very reassuring and wholesome development in defense personnel policy. Secretary Paul's speech to the thousands of delegates at the VFW convention was brief, but the thoughts he expressed are highly important. I am confident that Members of this House, who have long demonstrated an intense interest in the essentially human aspect of military personnel legislation will derive a sense of satisfaction and reassurance from the remarks of the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the introduction of Secretary Paul by the then national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, of Minnesota, and the address of Secretary Paul to the VFW convention:

INTRODUCTION OF HON. NORMAN S. PAUL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, MANPOWER AND RESERVE, BY ROBERT E. HANSEN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VFW

The VFW has long believed that the most important single feature of our defense establishment is people. Our organization historically has been extremely mindful of the importance of defense personnel policies.

Consequently, it is especially appropriate that one of the most distinguished personages at our national convention is the official whom I now have the pleasure of introducing, the Honorable Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve.

Secretary Paul is a native of Stamford, Conn., and received his law degree from the University of Virginia. During World War II he served in the Navy with the amphibious forces in the South Pacific. Following World War II he practiced law in New York City, and in 1948 he was appointed to the staff of the Economic Cooperation Administration. His rise in Government service has been rapid, and has reflected the high esteem in which he is held by those who have been associated with him.

Among his highly responsible positions was that of Deputy Assistant to the Administrator for International Security Affairs, which placed on Mr. Paul the responsibility for coordinating ECA activities on a worldwide basis.

Later he was program adviser in the Office of the Director of Mutual Security, handling economic and military assistance matters for Asia, Europe, and Latin America. The geographic scope of his responsibility was apparently constantly expanded because he later became Regional Director of the Foreign Operations Administration for the Far East, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Later he was Deputy Director of the FOA for Congressional Relations.

More recently he has served as legislative counsel for the Central Intelligence Agency, and, in January 1961, Mr. Paul was appointed Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. I might add there is an almost unique aspect to his record of achievement in that he has been appointed to one of the most important positions in the present administration, although he made no secret of the fact that he graduated from Yale rather than Harvard.

Seriously, we are honored to have with us one who has served our Nation so effectively and from whom so much is expected in the future. It is my privilege to present to you at this time the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Norman S. Paul.

Mr. Paul.

REMARKS BY HON. NORMAN S. PAUL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MANPOWER), TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 14, 1962

Commander Hansen, I am honored to be here today, and I thank you for the kind invitation which made this visit possible. I am also particularly indebted to my good friend, Gen. Don Hittle, who performs such an outstanding job for the Veterans of Foreign Wars the year around.

My remarks this morning will necessarily be on the brief side. Right now I am in the process of learning the requirements of a new job, and I was sworn in less than a week ago.

I do welcome the opportunity to meet with you today, however, both to renew acquaintances and to thank you for your devoted and continuing interest in the defense effort.

I know that our country owes much to this interest over the years. I see many people here who have made important contributions to the national security, and who have worked with the Department of Defense on many occasions, always with the objective of promoting America's strength and security.

From my own previous work with Congress I have observed the effectiveness of your

support for such programs as a better pay structure for the services, uniform travel policies for dependents of oversea personnel, a long-overdue increase in basic allowance for quarters, better housing for service families, and other measures of merit to numerous to mention. I am familiar, too, with the impressive backing which you have invariably given to extension of the draft authority, and to major readiness programs designed to increase the striking power and resilience of the total Military Establishment—power and resilience which we must have to maintain our freedom.

Above all, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have consistently borne in mind the fact that the men and women of the Armed Forces are individuals, not to be considered as so many numbers lumped in the mass, but instead to be looked upon each one as an important contributor to the national security. And as a consequence, you have not failed to sponsor and support responsible legislation in their behalf—and in behalf of their families. As a further consequence, you have helped the country at large to achieve a more mature and understanding view of the Armed Forces, and of the consideration to which they are entitled.

For all this, the Department of Defense, and the men and women of the services, are truly appreciative.

As I assume the responsibilities of the Manpower Office, I should like to say that I share your concern for the welfare of the individual serviceman, and on that and other subjects of national concern I am hopeful that I will have the frequent benefit of your views and counsel.

America possesses a mighty defense structure, involving the most advanced weaponry and scientific know-how, with a destructive capability second to none.

But we can never fail to remember that it is the human individual—the man and not the machine—who still provides the most important element of our strength.

People—people who can handle a great variety of complex weapons and functions, have never been more important than right now. Nor has it ever been more essential that we make use of such a precious asset intelligently.

From this it is plain that one of our principal responsibilities continues to be that of attracting, training and keeping the kind of high quality, high performance personnel that today's complex weapons systems demand, and those of tomorrow foreshadow.

And here again, it seems to me, one of the basic requirements for coping with the problem—both in its immediate and long-term sense—is a sustained program of realistic attention to the problems and needs of the individual serviceman and the service family—coupled with the awareness that they are deserving of the best. It is my job to see to it that major progress is made in this field.

To this effort—and to the continued best interests of the finest Armed Forces on earth—I pledge to you my sincere endeavor.

Thank you.

Dominion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure at this time for me to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by unanimous consent, the poem, "Dominion," written by Elizabeth Jor-

October 6

dan, an accomplished writer of Pittsburgh, Pa. This poem, written in 1941, 4 years before the then secret atomic bomb was used, shows clarity of vision and perception. I am enclosing for the RECORD this poem, "Dominion," of Elizabeth Jordan's, as reprinted from the Scientific Monthly of February 1945, volume LX, page 116.

DOMINION

Now man must take unto himself dominion,
The sovereignty he has given his inventions.
His is the brain behind his own machinery.
Should ever the lesser dispossess the greater?
The use beneficent, not the use injurious,
Should be his program, his unceasing doctrine.

The silver bird that spreads its wings to
heaven

Man's glorious conquest of the sky announces,

But how does man reward his own bright genius?

By hurling down—upon himself—destruction.

And on he goes, discovering and inventing.
An artless child near gas with matches playing.

The power he takes from earth's entrails will
seize him,

With earth-shaking fury rend him, him and
his offspring.

Before he further searches out the atom,
Let him ask himself this question: "Am I
ready?"

Until he is, he had better stay his power
And look within. And look within God
help him!

—ELIZABETH PARKHILL JORDAN.

What To Do in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the tide of frustration and anger generated by Cuba, it is easy to urge that action be taken which might turn out to be in the worst interests of the United States, not the best interests. The clear exposition of this argument I have yet seen was written by Malcolm S. Forbes, publisher and editor in chief of Forbes, in the October 1 issue of that magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND COMMENT—CUBA: COLD LOGIC, NOT HOT ANGER

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

If the American people were polled today, it's my guess a majority would favor "doing something about Cuba." Judging from conversations with many responsible American businessmen, it is clear that an even greater majority of them favor "action" by the United States.

"Doing something" and "action," can only mean some sort of military action. The choice is limited to actual invasion by our Armed Forces, possibly with a thin refugee Cuban facade at the outset, or a tight naval blockade. Somehow many seem to think

this latter course would be effective and bloodless.

But think it through.

Suppose we declare a naval blockade. Whether we exempt food or not would have to be decided at the outset. What happens if a Russian ship carrying supplies to Cuba refuses to halt when the shot goes across its bow? Do we then sink it and all that follow it? That, of course, would be a full and open act of war against Russia.

Suppose Russia did not respond to the sinking of her ships by the American Navy with an immediate declaration of war and the blasting of missiles at the continental United States. Suppose instead she instructs her several hundred submarines to sink American ships supplying our thousands of American Armed Forces in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and the other lands allied to us that surround the Communists.

We set the precedent by sinking Russian ships bound for Cuba. How do we react when she sinks ours supplying her unfriendly neighbors? It doesn't take much imagination to foresee that overnight we would be at the brink—or over it—of global atomic annihilation.

If one pauses to think, it becomes clear that Cuba, no matter how well supplied militarily, represents no real military threat to the United States. A very small number of short-range missiles would eliminate any menace in moments. Russian missiles can land anywhere in the United States from their own bases in their own land. They don't need Cuba as a launching spot.

The depth of American emotions about Russian aid to Red Cuba is very real and understandable. But emotions are a poor guide in a case like this.

Aside from a blockade, it is plain today that no small-scale invasion using conventional weapons would be successful. We would need a major effort by the Armed Forces, and it would come at a time when, after November 6, election day, the Berlin crisis will be unquestionably at a dangerous peak. When Khrushchev signs a "peace" treaty with East Germany as he plans to do, we cannot and will not allow East Germany to interfere or in any way control our access to West Berlin. The possibilities of a shooting war are going to be closer than ever in a few weeks over Berlin. In this situation, NATO and our allies are solidly agreed that there can be no retreat.

Such is simply not the case in connection with Cuba.

The dangers in Cuba come not because it is any military threat to this country, but because it forms a closer base for Red penetration in South America. We certainly can be effective in preventing the export of arms and subversives from Cuba to South American shores.

Measures are being considered to isolate the Cuban virus; but those so earnestly and loudly advocating military "action" should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

For a number of years, American forces have been training and arming troops—not 90 miles from Russia—but right at the Russian border. If we react to the presence of Russian troops in Cuba by an invasion of that island, Russia will certainly feel free to invade Iran or Turkey, Pakistan, or the NATO countries; and, of course, China will have a fresh excuse to attempt the invasion of Formosa, Thailand, and so forth.

There is little doubt that rising public anger over Cuba is cutting into President Kennedy's popularity. It recalls with full force the Bay of Pigs fiasco. I am certain the President is aware of this. But I believe he equally is aware—overwhelmingly so—of the incalculable dangers involved in undertaking what would be—for a fleeting moment—the popular course of "action."

Evaluation of the State Department's Briefing Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Elizabeth Jordan—Mrs. J. H. Jordan—of For-sythe Road, in the South Hills district of Pittsburgh, Pa. has written an excellent evaluation which I believe should be called to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

Elizabeth Jordan headed the editorial staff of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette for 2 years, was a member of the editorial staff of the Pittsburgh Press for 8 years, was contributing editor of the Pittsburgher magazine for 2 years, and in 1941 wrote a syndicated newspaper column on world law.

As to Elizabeth Jordan's radio and television background, she wrote and produced 22 radio programs for UNES-CO, interviewing foreign exchange students; wrote and produced a series of television programs 2 years ago for the Allegheny County Federation of Women's Clubs, discussing international problems, on WQED-TV, our Pittsburgh educational television station.

In 1937 Elizabeth Jordan founded the Charter Oak Community Club, and 7 years ago founded its international club. She was recognized for the outstanding work of this organization by the Pennsylvania State Federation of Women's Clubs at that organization's midwestern conference meeting held in New York City on Monday, October 1, 1962.

Elizabeth Jordan has suggested a change in emphasis in future State Department Briefing Conferences, which I believe should be given careful consideration:

May I suggest a change of emphasis in the future program of the State Department's briefing conferences. That the positive aspects of U.S. foreign policy be emphasized instead of the negative; that another feature speaker and discussion roundtable be added to the present procedure and placed in a position of overall importance. Reasons follow:

While the conference was most enlightening, I felt that it did not do justice to the long-range policy objectives of the United States which include a world legal order and arms control even to the extent of "general and complete disarmament." These objectives have been stated by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. They have been part of the proposals put forth by Secretaries of State Herter and Rusk. Please note that I am not a pacifist. I am disturbed, however, lest future briefing conferences again convey the impression that the United States of America does not really mean to implement its stated long-range policy objectives.

What is more, the briefing conference gave delegates almost no idea of the progress and problems involved in establishing a more effective world legal